

REMARKS

The required corrections have been implemented by canceling the objected to subject matter.


Reconsideration is requested with respect to the rejections of dependent claims 7, 13, 18, and 27. Each of these claims relate to the concept of tracking the "maximum possible pipeline stall cycles." It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references even contemplate the concept of maximum possible stall cycles, much less keep track of them.

For example, claim 7 was rejected based on the combination of Wang, Lam, Larson, and Merchant. However, none of these references teach even the concept of maximum stall cycles. It is suggested that Wang teaches using a number of maximum stall cycles at column 30, lines 12-26. But nothing therein talks about a maximum possible stall cycle. For example, he refers to a minimum number of cycles that must separate A and B to avoid stalls at lines 20 and 21, but there is no discussion of maximum possible stall cycles. Therefore, the references, even in combination, cannot meet the claimed limitation.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 19, 2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 S. Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation